

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 CARL DAVID WHITE,

12 Plaintiff,

2:04-cv-02276-GEB-GGH-P

13 vs.

14 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
15 OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,

16 Defendants.

ORDER

17 _____/
18 On August 4, 2005, the magistrate judge recommended
19 that defendants Gonzales and Moncayo be dismissed because
20 plaintiff was unable to obtain information necessary to effect
21 their service. On September 19, 2005, this court adopted the
22 findings and recommendations.

23 On September 21, 2005, defense counsel filed a copy of
24 a letter he sent to plaintiff on September 12, 2005. In this
25 letter, defense counsel provided plaintiff with information
26 necessary to effect service of defendants Gonzales and Moncayo.

1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. The September 19, 2005, order dismissing defendants
3 Gonzales and Moncayo is vacated;

4 2. The court will separately order service of these
5 defendants.

6 Dated: November 1, 2005

7
8 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
9 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
United States District Judge